

1 Wayne W. Call, Bar No. 56676
2 wcall@calljensen.com
3 Scott P. Shaw, Bar No. 223592
4 SShaw@calljensen.com
5 Deborah A. Gubernick, Bar No. 242483
6 DGubernick@calljensen.com
7 Samuel G. Brooks, Bar No. 272107
8 SBrooks@calljensen.com
9 CALL & JENSEN
10 A Professional Corporation
11 610 Newport Center Drive, Suite 700
12 Newport Beach, CA 92660
13 Tel: (949) 717-3000
14 Fax: (949) 717-3100

15 Ian G. McFarland, *pro hac vice*
16 imcfarland@merchantgould.com
17 MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
18 9717 Cogdill Road, Suite 101
19 Knoxville, TN 37932-3322
20 Tel.: (865) 380-5990
21 Fax: (865) 380-5999

22 John A. Clifford, *pro hac vice*
23 jclifford@merchantgould.com
24 Heather J. Kliebenstein, *pro hac vice*
25 hkliebenstein@merchantgould.com
26 Rachel Z. Scobie, *pro hac vice*
27 rscobie@merchantgould.com
28 Linhda Nguyen, Bar No. 301157
29 lnguyen@merchantgould.com
30 MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
31 3200 IDS Center
32 80 South Eighth Street
33 Minneapolis, MN 55402-2215
34 Tel.: (612) 371-5228
35 Fax: (612) 332-9081

36 Attorneys for Defendant Cosmetic Warriors Limited

37 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
38
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

39 PINKETTE CLOTHING, INC., a

40 | Case No. 15-CV-04950-SJO-AJW

1 California corporation,

2 Plaintiff,

3 vs.

4 COSMETIC WARRIORS LIMITED,
5 believed to be a United Kingdom limited
6 company doing business as LUSH
7 HANDMADE COSMETICS, and DOES 1-
9, inclusive,

8 Defendants.

9

**DEFENDANT'S REPLY IN SUPPORT
OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION IN
LIMINE NO. 8 TO EXCLUDE
TESTIMONY FROM DR. HIBBARD
REGARDING THE LEGAL
RELEVANCE OF DR.
JOACHIMSTHALER'S TESTIMONY**

Date: January 24, 2017

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: 10C

10 Complaint Filed: June 30, 2015
11 Trial Date: January 24, 2017

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
CALL &
JENSEN
EST. 1891

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 Dr. Jonathan Hibbard's opinions about the legal relevancy of the opinions of Dr.
 3 Erich Joachimsthaler (CWL's expert) are improper, unhelpful, and prejudicial.
 4 Pinkette Clothing Inc. ("Pinkette") attempts to blur the lines between Hibbard's
 5 various opinions in his report, stating Hibbard should be allowed to counter
 6 Joachimsthaler's opinions as to the strength of the LUSH brand. While it is true that
 7 Hibbard may rebut Joachimsthaler's opinions and opine that Joachimsthaler is wrong,
 8 Hibbard may not testify that Joachimsthaler's opinions are legally irrelevant. It is the
 9 Court's duty to instruct the jury on the law, and what the relevant standard is, not
 10 Hibbard's.

11 **II. HIBBARD'S TESTIMONY ON THE ISSUE OF LEGAL RELEVANCE IS
 12 IMPROPER, UNHELPFUL AND PREJUDICIAL**

13 Pinkette's opposition sets forth three unavailing arguments to avoid exclusion of
 14 part of Hibbard's proposed testimony. The first argument is that the Hibbard Report
 15 concerns the "relevancy of Dr. Joachimsthaler's opinions with regard to the specific
 16 2003-2004 time period and not with regard to whatever legal standard the Court may
 17 apply." (Pinkette Opposition (hereinafter "Opp.") (filed under seal) at 2.) This
 18 argument is a distinction without meaning. At trial, counsel for Pinkette will simply
 19 ask Hibbard about Joachimsthaler's opinions. As previewed in his report at paragraphs
 20 12-53, Hibbard will respond that Joachimsthaler's opinions on the strength of CWL's
 21 LUSH brand are not relevant under the law in this case because Joachimsthaler's cited
 22 evidence allegedly did not focus on the time period of 2003-2004, which he believes is
 23 the proper time period based on his understanding of the law.¹ Hibbard will essentially
 24 be telling the jury what the law should be, and that they should disregard
 25 Joachimsthaler's opinions in view of that law. This type of testimony is not proper.
 26

27

 28 ¹ CWL disagrees with this position, as set forth in CWL's Opposition to Pinkette's Motion to Exclude Expert Testimony, Report and, Opinions of Expert Witness Erich Joachimsthaler. (Doc. No. 149.)

1 Second, Pinkette argues that Hibbard is allowed to testify about his
 2 understanding and application of a particular legal standard. But here, Hibbard will go
 3 one step further and opine about the relevancy under the law of Joachimsthaler's
 4 opinions under what Pinkette claims is the applicable legal standard. The cases cited
 5 in CWL's initial brief in support of this motion excluded testimony about the
 6 relevancy under the law of evidence or another expert's opinions because such
 7 testimony is improper. (*See* Doc. No. 119 at 4.)

8 The cases cited by Pinkette, *Villalpando* and *Hangarter*, do not support the
 9 position that an expert can opine on the legal significance (i.e., relevance) of another
 10 expert's opinions, or other facts in the case. For example, in *Villalpando v. Exel*
 11 *Direct Inc.*, 161 F. Supp. 3d 873, 895 (N.D. Cal. 2016), the Court allowed a damages
 12 expert to testify that he had been asked to make certain assumptions as to what
 13 expenses were recoverable and/or what deductions were allowable under the law, but
 14 did not allow that expert to testify as to the legal basis for those assumptions. *Id.* In
 15 *Hangarter v. Provident Life and Accident Insurance Co.*, 373 F.3d 998, 1017 (9th Cir.
 16 2004), the expert was allowed to testify that the defendants deviated from industry
 17 standards, which the jury used to support a finding that the defendant acted in bad
 18 faith. An expert can opine on industry standards. An expert cannot instruct the jury on
 19 the law. Here, Hibbard improperly intends to instruct on the law and tell the jury that
 20 it should disregard Joachimsthaler's opinions because he applied the wrong law.
 21 Neither of Pinkette's cited cases address such a situation. And such testimony is
 22 improper.

23 Pinkette's third argument is that the challenged Hibbard opinions in paragraphs
 24 12-53 of the Hibbard Report "directly rebut the position taken by Dr. Joachimsthaler"
 25 that the LUSH brand was strong in 2003. This is a mischaracterization of Hibbard's
 26 report. Hibbard's substantive rebuttal of Joachimstaler's views on the strength of the
 27 LUSH brand is found in the second half of the Hibbard Report (¶¶ 54-109), which is

28
 CALL &
 JENSEN
 EST. 1981

1 unchallenged in this motion. CWL is not seeking to prevent Hibbard from
2 substantively challenging Joachimsthaler's opinions. As Hibbard acknowledged at his
3 deposition, the only purpose of paragraphs 12-53 was to explain that Joachimsthaler's
4 opinions were based on the wrong time period according to what Hibbard was told is
5 the applicable law. More problematic is that what Hibbard was told about the law was
6 wrong. Thus, he not only tries to improperly invade the province of the Court by
7 instructing the jury on the law, but also tries to instruct the jury on legal standards that
8 are not correct.

9 **IV. CONCLUSION**

10 For all the reasons stated, CWL respectfully requests the Court grant its motion
11 to exclude Hibbard's opinions regarding the legal relevance of Dr. Joachimsthaler's
12 testimony.

13

14 Dated: December 30, 2016

15 CALL & JENSEN
A Professional Corporation
Deborah A. Gubernick

16

17 By: /s/ Deborah A. Gubernick
Deborah A. Gubernick

18

Attorneys for Defendant

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28